DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 100 598 RC 008 299

AUTHOR	Casso, Henry J.; Garcia, Joseph O.
TITLE	An Analysis of the Evaluation of the Arizona First Annual Bilingual Institute (Nogales, Arizona, March 21-23, 1974).
INSTITUTION	National Education Task Force de la Raza, Albuquerque, N. Mex.
SPONS AGENCY	Arizona State Dept. of Education, Phoenix.; Nogales Elementary School District 1, Ariz.; Nogales High School District 10, Ariz.
PUB DATE	23 Mar 74
NOTE	71p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.75 HC-$3.15 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS	American Indians; Attitudes; *Bilingual Education; *Data Analysis; *Institutes (Training Programs); *Mexican Americans; Participant Characteristics; Spanish Speaking; *Summative Evaluation; Teacher Education
IDENTIFIERS	*Arizona

ABSTRACT

Attending the Institute on March 21-23, 1974 in Nogales (Arizona) were 300 or more administrators, state department officials, project coordinators, teachers, university professors, citizens, and students from throughout the state. Following the central theme, "Education for the 70's", the institute's goal was to "impact the development of Bilingual Bicultural Education for the 70's in Arizona." Toward its conclusion, the participants were given an evaluation questionnaire; 139 were returned. The questionnaire was composed of two parts designed to secure information about their: (1) sex, ethnic identification, age, employment status and level, participation in bilingual program, and description of the program; and (2) reactions to the institute. Each item was analyzed individually. Responses indicated a high percentage (61.8 percent) of the participants had a favorable overall impression of the institute. This paper gives: (1) the item as it appeared on the questionnaire, (2) an item frequency selection from a computer print out showing how the respondents responded, (3) a narrative of the item's purpose, and (4) an analysis of the results. (NQ)

ED100598

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

AN ANALYSIS OF THE EVALUATION OF THE ARIZONA FIRST ANNUAL BILINGUAL INSTITUTE

By

Dr. Henry J. Casso

Joseph O. García

Sponsored By:

Arizona State Department of Education
National Education Task Force de la Raza
Nogales Public Schools

March 21-23, 1974

National Education Task Force de la Raza
College of Education
The University of New Mexico
Albuquerque, New Mexico 87131

Phone 277-5649
277-5640

RC008299

PREFACE

This report contains information taken from a survey especially prepared for the Arizona First Bilingual Institute based on a similar survey prepared for the National Bilingual Bicultural Institute, Albuquerque, New Mexico, November 28 - December 1, 1973. As the reader reviews the Statement of Goals of the Institute, it is clear that the Institute desired to impact the development of Bilingual Bicultural Education for the 70's in Arizona. In view of the fact that the respondent participants represent the views of administrators, state department officials, project coordinators, teachers, university professors, community and students, these findings take on greater significance. It should be noted that the participants and respondents came from throughout Arizona. Therefore, it can be reasonably concluded that this report reflects the thinking in Arizona.

This work would not have been possible without the able and dedicated work of Joseph Garcia (doctoral candidate) of the College of Education, at the University of New Mexico, who designed the instrument and worked very closely with Dr. Luis Casaus of the College of Education, Arizona State University and Mr. Ramon Paz, Director of Bilingual Education, Nogales School District.

An objective of this report is not only to record the thinking of the Arizona participants, but likewise to point out areas of further development for future Bilingual Institutes in Arizona. This information can not only improve subsequent institutes but will give education leadership a more accurate sense of what is going on in the various parts of the state, what is desired, and what is hoped for.

0003

It is our hope in the National Education Task Force de la Raza that the findings of this report will be utilized for setting trends for Bilingual Bicultural Education for the 70's in Arizona, and play its role in providing quality education for the linguistically and culturally distinct child in Arizona.

Certainly this work is perceived as a valuable contribution of the Chicano community toward Bilingual Bicultural Education and ultimately to Cultural Pluralism in Arizona, the Southwest and the nation.

Dr. Henry J. Casso
Executive Secretary
National Education Task Force de la Raza

0004

OVERVIEW OF THE ARIZONA FIRST ANNUAL BILINGUAL INSTITUTE

The Arizona First Annual Bilingual Institute sponsored by the Nogales Public Schools, Arizona State Department of Education, and the National Education Task Force de la Raza was held on March 21-23, 1974 in Nogales, Arizona. The Institute attracted approximately 300 participants from throughout the state.

On Thursday, March 21, 1974 from 4:00 to 10:00 P.M. participants to the Institute registered and attended a social hosted by Nogales Public Schools.

On Friday, March 22, 1974 Ramon Paz, James Clark, Victor Fontes, Louis Doyle, Mayor Arthur Doan, James George and W. P. Shoftstall welcomed the participants to the Institute. Maria Urquides, the opening guest speaker, addressed the participants on the "History of Arizona Bilingual Education". Al Jaurequi, Program Chairman, followed Maria Urquides' opening address with an "Orientation to the Program".

The Institute provided its participants five workshops which were held simultaneously Friday morning. The sessions were repeated after a fifteen minute break to allow the participants to attend other sessions of interest. The workshops included the following areas:

I Bilingual Education - Multiple Offense

II Alternate Resources

III State Bilingual Programs

IV Media Fair Presentation

V Federal Bilingual Programs

Friday's luncheon was chaired by Ramon Paz. Guest speakers for the luncheon, James Altop, Vice President, Personnel Administration of Valley National Bank, spoke on "The Bilingual in Business". The second guest speaker was Dr. Henry J. Casso, Executive Secretary of the National Education Task Force de la Raza, who spoke on the "National Bilingual Institute and It's Implications for a Statewide Design in Arizona".

Following the luncheon there were four sessions which were repeated to provide participants the opportunity to attend other sessions. These sessions included:

I Community/Junior Colleges

II Bilingual Legislation

III Indian Education

IV Higher Education

Late Friday afternoon the Institute provided its participants with three more sessions entitled:

I Alternative Approaches to Bilingual Education

II Indian Education

III Teacher Training

Friday's general session was also chaired by Ramon Paz. The two guest speakers for the session included Adalberto Guerrero, member of the Executive Committee, and Senator D. Delos Ellsworth, Chairman of the Arizona Senate Education Committee.

Friday's activities were concluded with a fiesta. Providing the entertainment for the fiesta included Plains Indian Dance Group, and a Pachanga with the Motorola Musical Group.

On Saturday, March 23, 1974 five more sessions were held in the areas of:

I Media Fair Presentation

II Parental Involvement in Education

III Curriculum Offerings

IV Teacher Aide Training

V Bilingual Children's Television

A general session chaired by Ramon Paz followed the five sessions. Hank Oyama commented on the resolutions that were generated during the Institute.

At Saturday noon the Institute came to a successful conclusion as the evaluation will reveal.

STATEMENT OF GOALS

On March 21-23, 1974 the Nogales Public Schools, Arizona State Department of Education and the National Education Task Force de la Raza jointly sponsored the Arizona First Annual Bilingual Institute. The central theme of the Institute was entitled "Education for the 70's".

The Institute set forth the accomplishment of four goals:

Provide opportunities for participants to acquire greater knowledge, skills and expertise that will enable them to influence the direction of bilingual education.

Create a greater state-wide awareness of and involvement in bilingual education.

Provide the participants the opportunity to examine current programs as they relate to teaching practices, teacher preparation, legislation, and funding possibilities.

Promote in the participant a commitment to the full development of the bilingual abilities of the individual as a viable national asset.

The Institute also hoped to satisfy the following five objectives:

Review present and pending state bilingual legislation and appropriations.

Demonstrate techniques and methodology for successful implementation of bilingual education.

Formulate a state-wide task force on bilingual education to serve on an advisory capacity to the State Department of Education.

Provide the participants with specific data on the gains and performance of existing bilingual programs as related to administrators, teachers, students and the community.

Identify and reinforce the developing leaders from Arizona in the implementation of the educational processes pertinent to the concept of bilingual education.

0008

An instrument in the form of a questionnaire was developed specifically to assess the Institute's goals and objectives by Joseph Garcia, graduate student at the University of New Mexico and Dr. Louis Casaus, Professor, College of Education, Arizona State University. The evaluation of the Arizona First Annual Bilingual Institute will be based to a large extent on the analysis of this instrument.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PREFACE i

OVERVIEW OF THE ARIZONA FIRST ANNUAL BILINGUAL INSTITUTE iii

STATEMENT OF GOALS vi

INTRODUCTION 1

PART I - PARTICIPANT CHARACTERISTICS 3

PART II - ANALYSIS OF INSTITUTE 17

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

PART I

PARTICIPANT CHARACTERISTICS

TABLES PAGES

1. Sex....3

2. Ethnic Identification....5

3. Age....7

4. Employment Status....9

5. Are you presently participating in a Bilingual Program?....11

6. Level of Employment....13

7. Statement which best describes bilingual program regarding home language development ....

a) Language Maintenance Program....
b) Transitional Program
c) Not directly involved in a Bilingual Program....15

PART II

ANALYSIS OF THE INSTITUTE

8. Extent Institute provide opportunities to acquire greater knowledge, skills and expertise to influence direction of bilingual education....17

9. Extent Institute created greater statewide awareness of bilingual education....19

10. Institute help to make me become more involved in Bilingual Education....21

Extent Institute provided opportunity to examine current programs as the relate to

11. a) Teaching practice....23

12. b) Teacher preparation....25

13. c) Legislation....27

14. d) Funding Possibilities....29

TABLES		PAGES
15.	Institute success in promoting a comunitment to the full development of the bilingual abilities of the individual as a viable asset	31
16.	Review of present and pending state Bilingual Education legislation and appropriations helpful in defining new directions for influencing future legislation in Bilingual Education	33
17.	Extent Institute demonstrate techniques and methodology for successful implementation of Bilingual Education	35
18.	Do your feel there is a need to formulate a statewide task force on Bilingual Education to serve in an advisory capacity to the State Department of Education	37
19.	Institute provided data concernin pupil gains and performance of existing bilingual programs	39
20.	Bilingual program of instruction should be conceived as a continuous program from preschool to high school	41
21.	Recruitment and hiring of teachers with an ethnic identity representative of the ethnic composition of the school is a high priority in my district or project	43
	In preparation of teachers for bilingual programs, what priority should be given to the following	
22.	a) The personal qualitiies of a teacher	45
23.	b) The teacher's knowledge of children and appreciation of the community from which their students derive	47
24.	c) Skills in the teaching process	49
25.	d) The teacher be bilingual	51
26.	The Institute fulfilled my expectation	53
27.	Overall impression of this Institute	55

INTRODUCTION

AN ANALYSIS OF THE EVALUATION OF THE ARIZONA FIRST ANNUAL BILINGUAL INSTITUTE

The evaluation questionnaire is composed of two distinct parts. The first part consists of seven items which are designed to secure information about the participants. The desired information about the participants consists of the participants' sex, ethnic identification, age, employment status, participation in bilingual program, level of employment and description of bilingual program engaged in. The second part of the questionnaire is composed of fourteen items designed to secure information from the participants concerning the Institute.

Of the total approximate 400 participants at the Institute, 139 responded to the questionnaire which was administered toward the conclusion of the Institute.

The format of the analysis consists of two pages per item. Each item is analyzed individually. At the top of the first page appears the item as it appeared on the questionnaire. On the same page there is an item frequency selection from a computer print out showing how the 139 respondents responded to this item. The second page consists of a narrative dealing with the purpose of the item and an analysis of the results.

Purpose of the Item

The intent of this item was to assess the participants' overall impression of the Institute.

Analysis of the Results

Of the total (139) respondents, 15 or 10.8% did not respond to this item. Of those responding, 86 or 61.8% had a favorable overall impression of the Institute. On the other hand, only 5 or 3.6%* of the respondents had an unfavorable impression of the Institute. Thirty-three or 23.8%* of the respondents held an indifferent impression of the Institute.

Given these results, it can be said that a high percentage (61.8%) of the participants had a favorable overall impression of the Institute. In this respect it can further be said that the Arizona First Annual Bilingual Institute was a success according to a majority of its participants.

---

* The architects of the Institute may want to determine the characteristics of these participants, which information should be useful in future Institute design.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

PART I

PARTICIPANT CHARACTERISTICS
TABLE I

AN EVALUATION OF THE ARIZONA FIRST
ANNUAL BILINGUAL INSTITUTE

A. Sex: Male _____ Female _____

VALUE LABEL	VALUE	ABSOLUTE FREQUENCY	RELATIVE FREQUENCY (PERCENT)
NO RESPONSE	0.0	6	4.3
MALE	1.00	53	38.1
FEMALE	2.00	80	57.6
	TOTAL	139	100.0

Purpose of the Item

The intent of this item was to determine the percentage of male and female participants in attendance at the Institute.

Analysis of the Results

Of the total (139) respondents, 6 or 4.3% did not respond to this item. Of those responding 53 or 38.1% were male and 80 or 57.6% were female. It is interesting to note that almost two-thirds of the participants were female. It appears that in the state of Arizona the topic of bilingual education is of more concern and interest to the female population than the male population.

Suggestions for Further Analysis and/or Future Research

It would be of interest to learn if there exists significant differences in how the males and females responded to the fourteen items concerning the Institute. Also, it might be worthwhile noting the characteristic variables according to sex in the other six respondent characteristic items.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TABLE 2

B. Ethnic Identification _____

VALUE LABEL	VALUE	ABSOLUTE FREQUENCY	RELATIVE FREQUENCY (PERCENT)
NO RESPONSE	0.0	15	10.8
CHICANO	1.00	19	13.7
MEXICAN AMERICAN	2.00	47	33.8
ANGLO	3.00	39	28.1
OTHER	4.00	19	13.7
	TOTAL	139	100.0

Purpose of the Item

The intent of this item was to identify the ethnic composition of the Institute's participants. Categories were not preselected to avoid bias in the participant's response. It was intended that the participants would classify themselves.

Analysis of the Results

Of the total (139) respondents, 15 or 10.8% chose not to respond to this item. Those participants who identified themselves as "Mexican American" comprised the largest percentage of participants at the Institute. There were 19 or 13.7% respondents who identified themselves as "Chicano". The next largest ethnic group to be represented consisted of 39 or 28.1% "Anglo". The 19 or 13.7% of the respondents that constitute "Others" are composed of all other ethnic I.D.'s exclusive of the above four. Such ethnic I.D.'s included; Italian, Navajo, Spanish American, Black, Latin American and Papago Indian. Most of the respondents marking "others" did not specify their ethnic identity.

Suggestions For Further Analysis and/or Future Research

It would be of great interest to compare how each of the four ethnic groups responded to each of the other items in the questionnaire.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TABLE 3

C. Age: _____ 20 or under _____ 21 - 30 _____ 31 - 40
_____ 41 - 50 _____ 51 - 60 _____ 61 and over

VALUE LABEL	VALUE	ABSOLUTE FREQUENCY	RELATIVE FREQUENCY (PERCENT)
NO RESPONSE	0.0	6	4.3
20 OR UNDER	1.00	3	2.2
21 TO 30	2.00	45	32.4
31 TO 40	3.00	35	25.2
41 TO 50	4.00	30	21.6
51 TO 60	5.00	19	13.7
61 AND OVER	6.00	1	0.7
	TOTAL	139	100.0

Purpose of the Item

The intent of this item was to determine the approximate age level of the Institute's participants. The secondary purpose of this item was to identify the age level bilingual education has the greatest professional appeal.

Analysis of the Results

Of the total (139) respondents, 6 or 4.3% chose not to respond to this particular item. The largest age level represented at the Institute consisted of those participants in the age category between "21 to 30". Of these there were 45 or 32.4% respondents. The next largest representation consisted of respondents in the age categories between "31 to 40". Of the total respondents there were also 30 or 21.6% respondents between the ages of "41 to 50". On the other hand there were 19 or 13.7% respondents between the ages of "51 to 60". One or .7% respondents in the ages "61 and over" responded to the questionnaire. The next smallest age category represented at the Institute according to the respondents is that of "21 and under". Of these there were only 3 or 2.2% respondents. It can be concluded that the Bilingual professional in Arizona are of a younger age.

Suggestions For Further Analysis and/or Future Research

It would be interesting to note if the attitudes toward bilingual education are a function of age. Namely, are there any significant differences between the five age categories as to how the respondents responded to each item of the questionnaire.

TABLE 4

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

D. Employment Status:

_____ Legislator	_____ Administrator	_____ Project/Program Coordinator
_____ Teacher	_____ Professor	_____ Paraprofessional (aide)
_____ Community Representative		_____ Business Representative
_____ Student		_____ Other _____

VALUE LABEL	VALUE	ABSOLUTE FREQUENCY	RELATIVE FREQUENCY (PERCENT)
NO RESPONSE	0.0	4	2.9
LEGISLATOR	1.00	1	0.7
TEACHER	2.00	47	33.8
COMMUNITY REP	3.00	6	4.3
STUDENT	4.00	13	9.4
ADMINISTRATOR	5.00	19	13.7
PROFESSOR	6.00	7	5.0
PROJECT COORDINATOR	7.00	6	4.3
PARAPROFESSIONAL	8.00	11	7.9
BUSINESS REP	9.00	2	1.4
OTHER	10.00	23	16.5
	TOTAL	139	100.0

Purpose of the Item

The intent of this item was to secure information from the respondent concerning employment status. The primary question being, are the participants mostly administrators, teachers, or others?

Analysis of the Results

Of the total (139) respondents, 4 or 2.9% did not respond to this particular item. Of those responding the teachers comprised the best representation consisting of 47 or 33.8% of the total. The next best representation consisted of administrators, the number being 19 or 13.7% of the total. This figure is closely followed by 13 or 9.4% students, 11 or 7.9% paraprofessionals; 7 or 5.0% professors. The community representatives and project coordinators consisted of 6 or 4.3% of the total respondents, 2 or 1.4% business representatives, and 1 or .7% legislators. There were 23 or 16.5% of the respondents who identified themselves in the "other" category.

TABLE 5

E. Are you presently participating in a Bilingual Program? Yes ___ No ___

VALUE LABEL	VALUE	ABSOLUTE FREQUENCY	RELATIVE FREQUENCY (PERCENT)
NO RESPONSE	0.0	11	7.9
YES	1.00	64	46.0
NO	2.00	64	46.0
	TOTAL	139	100.0

Purpose of the Item

The intent of this item was to determine what percentage of the Institute participants are presently participating in a bilingual program.

Analysis of the Results

Of the total (139) respondents 11 or 7.9% did not respond to this particular item. Of those responding 64 or 46% stated they were participating in a bilingual program. The remaining 64 or 46% stated they were not participating in a bilingual program. Given these results it can be said that a relatively high percentage of the Institute's participants, though not engaged in a bilingual program, are interested enough in the program to attend a statewide Institute on bilingual education. Thus bilingual education has not only a large following but an equally large percentage of curious investigators.

Suggestions For Further Analysis and/or Future Research

It would be worth investigating if there exists significant differences for each item between the participants and non-participants in bilingual education programs.

TABLE 6

F. Level of Employment:

_____ Elementary School	_____ Middle School	_____ Secondary School
_____ District School	_____ Community College	_____ University
_____ Community	_____ State	_____ Federal
_____ Other (specify)	_____	

VALUE LABEL	VALUE	ABSOLUTE FREQUENCY	RELATIVE FREQUENCY (PERCENT)
NO RESPONSE	0.0	4	2.9
ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	1.00	70	50.4
DISTRICT SCHOOL	2.00	12	8.6
COMMUNITY	3.00	5	3.6
FEDERAL	4.00	1	0.7
MIDDLE SCHOOL	5.00	4	2.9
COMMUNITY COLLEGE	6.00	9	6.5
STATE	7.00	3	2.2
SECONDARY SCHOOL	8.00	9	6.5
UNIVERSITY	9.00	5	3.6
OTHER	10.00	17	12.2
	TOTAL	139	100.0

Purpose of the Item

The intent of this item was to determine the participants' level of participation in bilingual education programs.

Analysis of the Results

Of the total (139) respondents 4 or 2.9% failed to respond to this item. Of those responding 70 or 50.4% were engaged in bilingual programs at the elementary level; this represents the highest level of participation. The second highest number of respondents, 12 or 8.6%, indicated they participated in bilingual programs at school district level. The third highest level of participation came from respondents participating at both community college and secondary school level consisting of 9 or 6.5% respondents.

The remaining respondents indicated their level of participation in bilingual programs as follows: both community and university 5 or 3.6%, middle school 4 or 2.9%, state 3 or 2.2%, federal 1 or .7%. There were 17 or 12.2% respondents who indicated their level of participation in bilingual programs was at a level "other" than those mentioned above.

TABLE 7

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

G. Check the statement below which best describes your bilingual program with regard to Home language/English language development.

_____ 1. Language Maintenance Program (The instructional program is designed to develop and expand the two languages and related cultures throughout the course of the program).

_____ 2. Transitional Program (The Home language is used in the instructional program for the child as a "bridge" to learning English. Once the child has achieved an adequate command of English, the home language is dropped from his instructional program.)

_____ 3. Not directly involved in a bilingual Program.

VALUE LABEL	VALUE	ABSOLUTE FREQUENCY	RELATIVE FREQUENCY (PERCENT)
NO RESPONSE	0.0	26	18.7
LANGUAGE MAINT PROG	1.00	50	36.0
TRANSITIONAL PROGRAM	2.00	18	12.9
NOT INVOLVED BIL PGM	3.00	45	32.4
	TOTAL	139	100.0

Purpose of the Item

The intent of this item was to determine the type of bilingual program the respondents are engaged in with regard to Spanish/English language development. Two options were made available: Language Maintenance Program and The Transitional Program.

Analysis of the Results

Of the total (139) respondents 26 or 18.7% did not respond to this item. The high "no response" rate can be a-tributed in part to the fact that on Item E there were 64 respondents who indicated they were not engaged in a bilingual program. Of those responding 50 or 36% indicated they employed the Language Maintenance Program in language development. On the other hand only 18 or 12.9% of the respondents indicated they employed the Transitional Program as a means of language development. Forty-five or 32.4% of the respondents indicated they were not directly involved in a bilingual program.

Given these results it can be said that the Language Maintenance Program is the more extensively utilized educational strategy of the two in terms of Spanish/English language development.

PART II

ANALYSIS OF THE INSTITUTE

TABLE 8

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

1. To what extent did the Institute provide you the opportunities to acquire greater knowledge, skills, and expertise that will enable you to influence the direction of bilingual education?

Very Little — Very Much

1 2 3 4 5 6

VALUE LABEL	VALUE	ABSOLUTE FREQUENCY	RELATIVE FREQUENCY (PERCENT)
NO RESPONSE	0.0	7	5.0
VERY LITTLE	1.00	3	2.2
	2.00	5	3.6
	3.00	24	17.3
	4.00	35	25.2
	5.00	39	28.1
VERY MUCH	6.00	26	18.7
	TOTAL	139	100.0

Purpose of the Item

The intent of this item was to determine the extent to which the Institute provided its participants the opportunity to acquire greater knowledge, skills and expertise that will enable them to influence the direction of bilingual education.

Analysis of the Results

Of the total (139) respondents 7 or 5% chose not to respond to this item. Of those responding 8 or 5.8% felt the Institute had provided little opportunities to acquire greater knowledge, skills and expertise. On the other hand there were 65 or 46.8% of the respondents who felt the Institute had in fact provided them with opportunities to acquire greater knowledge, skills and expertise that will enable them to influence the direction of bilingual education. Fifty-nine or 42.5% of the respondents felt indifferent toward this item.

Given these results it can be said that a high percentage of the participants felt the Institute had provided them with opportunities to acquire greater knowledge, skills and expertise that will enable them to influence the direction of bilingual education.

TABLE 9

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

2. To what extent has the Institute created a greater statewide awareness of bilingual education?

Very Little 1 2 3 4 5 6 Very Much

VALUE LABEL	VALUE	ABSOLUTE FREQUENCY	RELATIVE FREQUENCY (PERCENT)
NO RESPONSE	0.0	13	9.4
VERY LITTLE	1.00	2	1.4
	3.00	15	10.8
	4.00	26	18.7
	5.00	39	28.1
VERY MUCH	6.00	44	31.7
	TOTAL	139	100.0

Purpose of the Item

The intent of this item was to determine the extent to which the Institute had created a greater statewide awareness of bilingual education.

Analysis of the Results

Of the total (139) respondents 13 or 9.4% did not respond to this item. Of those responding 2 or 1.4% felt the Institute had created little statewide awareness of bilingual education. On the other hand 83 or 59.8% of the respondents felt the Institute had created a greater statewide awareness of bilingual education. Forty-one or 29.5% of the respondents felt indifferent toward this item.

Given these results it can be said that the Institute was successful in creating a greater statewide awareness of bilingual education.

TABLE 10

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

3. The Institute will make me become more involved in Bilingual Education.

Strongly Agree — Strongly Disagree
1 2 3 4 5 6

VALUE LABEL	VALUE	ABSOLUTE FREQUENCY	RELATIVE FREQUENCY (PERCENT)
NO RESPONSE	0.0	10	7.2
STRONGLY AGREE	1.00	51	36.7
	2.00	24	17.3
	3.00	12	8.6
	4.00	12	8.6
	5.00	14	10.1
STRONGLY DISAGREE	6.00	16	11.5
	TOTAL	139	100.0

Purpose of the Item

The intent of this item was to determine the extent to which the Institute would make its participants become more involved in bilingual education.

Analysis of the Results

Of the total (139) respondents 10 or 7.2% did not respond to this particular item. Of those responding 75 or 54% felt that as a result of the Institute they would become more involved in bilingual education. On the other hand 30 or 21.6% disagreed with the above and felt that the Institute had not made them become more involved in bilingual education. Twenty-four or 17.2% of the respondents felt indifferent toward this item.

Given these results it can be said that as a result of the Institute a relatively high percentage (54%) of the respondents felt they would become more involved in bilingual education.

TABLE 11

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

4. To what extent has the Institute provided you the opportunity to examine current programs as they relate to:

	Very Little					Very Much
a) Teaching practice	1	2	3	4	5	6

VALUE LABEL	VALUE	ABSOLUTE FREQUENCY	RELATIVE FREQUENCY (PERCENT)
NO RESPONSE	0.0	15	10.8
VERY LITTLE	1.00	16	11.5
	2.00	9	6.5
	3.00	22	15.8
	4.00	28	20.1
	5.00	29	20.9
VERY MUCH	6.00	20	14.4
	TOTAL	139	100.0

Purpose of the Item

The intent of this item was to determine the extent to which the Institute provided its participants the opportunity to examine current programs as they relate to teaching practice.

Analysis of the Results

Of the total (139) respondents 15 or 10.8% failed to respond to this item. One reason for the high "no response" rate is attributable to the fact that the respondents were uncertain about the meaning of "current programs" used in the question. The question implies "current bilingual programs."* Of those responding 25 or 18% felt the Institute had provided them little opportunity to examine current programs as they relate to teaching practices. On the other hand 49 or 35.3% of the respondents felt the Institute had provided them such an opportunity. Fifty or 35.9% of the respondents felt indifferent toward this item.

Given these results it can be said that the Institute was successful in providing approximately 35.3% of its participants the opportunity to examine current programs as they relate to teaching practice. However, future Institutes may want to further develop this critical area.

---

*Questions 4a, 4b, 4c, and 4d appeared to cause confusion for the respondents.

TABLE 12

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

4. To what extent has the Institute provided you the opportunity to examine current programs as they relate to:

b) Teacher preparation

Very Little 1 2 3 4 5 6 Very Much

VALUE LABEL	VALUE	ABSOLUTE FREQUENCY	RELATIVE FREQUENCY (PERCENT)
NO RESPONSE	0.0	26	18.7
VERY LITTLE	1.00	11	7.9
	2.00	13	9.4
	3.00	18	12.9
	4.00	22	15.8
	5.00	30	21.6
VERY MUCH	6.00	19	13.7
	TOTAL	139	100.0

Purpose of the Item

The intent of this item was to determine the extent to which the Institute provided its participants the opportunity to examine current programs as they relate to teacher preparation.

Analysis of the Results

Of the total (139) respondents 26 or 18.7% failed to respond to this item. A reason for the relatively high percentage of "no response" is given in the analysis of item 4a. Of those responding 24 or 17.3% felt the Institute had provided little opportunity to examine current programs as they relate to teacher preparation. On the other hand 49 or 35.3% of the respondents felt the Institute had provided its participants the opportunity to examine current programs relating to teacher preparation. Forty or 28.7% of the respondents felt indifferent toward this item.

Given these results it can be said that the Institute was successful in providing 35.3% of its participants the opportunity to examine current programs as they relate to teacher preparation.

TABLE 13

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

4. To what extent has the Institute provided you the opportunity to examine current programs as they relate to:

c) Legislation — Very Little 1 2 3 4 5 6 Very Much

VALUE LABEL	VALUE	ABSOLUTE FREQUENCY	RELATIVE FREQUENCY (PERCENT)
NO RESPONSE	0.0	16	11.5
VERY LITTLE	1.00	18	12.9
	2.00	12	8.6
	3.00	26	18.7
	4.00	27	19.4
	5.00	24	17.3
VERY MUCH	6.00	16	11.5
	TOTAL	139	100.0

Purpose of the Item

The intent of this item was to determine the extent to which the Institute provided its participants the opportunity to examine current programs as they relate to legislation.

Analysis of the Results

Of the total (139) respondents 16 or 11.5% did not respond to this item. A reason for the relatively high percentage of "no response" is given in the anlysis of item 4a. Of those responding 30 or 21.5% felt the Institute had provided little opportunity to examine current programs as they relate to legislation. On the other hand 40 or 28.8% of the respondents felt the Institute had provided its participants the opportunity to examine similar programs. There was an even high number, 53 or 37.1% of the respondents who felt indifferent toward this item.

Given these results it can be said that the Institute was successful in providing 28.8% of its participants the opportunity to examine current programs as they relate to legislation. Future Institute designs may want to provide a greater awareness in the area of legislation, state and national.

TABLE 14

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

4. To what extent has the Institute provided you the opportunity to examine current programs as they relate to:

	Very Little					Very Much
d) Funding Possibilities	1	2	3	4	5	6

VALUE LABEL	VALUE	ABSOLUTE FREQUENCY	RELATIVE FREQUENCY (PERCENT)
NO RESPONSE	0.0	24	17.3
VERY LITTLE	1.00	11	7.9
	2.00	13	9.4
	3.00	20	14.4
	4.00	22	15.8
	5.00	28	20.1
VERY MUCH	6.00	21	15.1
	TOTAL	139	100.0

Purpose of the Item

The intent of this item is to determine the extent to which the Institute provided its participants the opportunity to examine current programs as they relate to funding possibilities.

Analysis of the Results

Of the total (139) respondents 24 or 17.3% failed to respond to this particular item. A reason for the relatively high percentage of "no response" is given in the analysis of item 4a. Of those responding 24 or 17.3% felt the Institute had provided little opportunity to examine current programs as they relate to funding possibilities. On the other hand 49 or 35.2% of the respondents felt the Institute had provided its participants the opportunity to examine similar programs. There were almost just as many respondents, 42 or 30.2% who felt indifferent toward this item.

Given these results it can be said that the Institute was successful in providing 35.2% of its participants the opportunity to examine current programs as they relate to funding possibilities.

TABLE 15

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

5. The Institute was successful in promoting within me a commitment to the full development of the bilingual abilities of the individual as a viable asset.

Strongly Agree — Strongly Disagree
1 2 3 4 5 6

VALUE LABEL	VALUE	ABSOLUTE FREQUENCY	RELATIVE FREQUENCY (PERCENT)
NO RESPONSE	0.0	8	5.8
STRONGLY AGREE	1.00	44	31.7
	2.00	29	20.9
	3.00	18	12.9
	4.00	14	10.1
	5.00	14	10.1
STRONGLY DISAGREE	6.00	12	8.6
	TOTAL	139	100.0

Purpose of the Item

The intent of this item was to determine the extent to which the Institute was successful in promoting within its participants a commitment toward the full development of the bilingual abilities of the individual as a viable asset.

Analysis of the Results

Of the total (139) respondents 8 or 5.8% did not respond to this item. Of those responding 73 or 52.6% felt the Institute was successful in promoting within its participants such a commitment. There were 26 or 18.7% of the respondents who felt the Institute was not successful in promoting within its participants a commitment to the full development of bilingual abilities of the individual as a viable asset. Thirty-two or 23% of the respondents felt indifferent toward this item.

Given these results it can be said that the Institute was successful in promoting within its participants a commitment ot the full development of the bilingual abilities of the individual as a viable asset.

TABLE 16

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

6. The review of present and pending <u>state</u> Bilingual Education legislation and appropriations was helpful in defining new directions for influencing future legislation in Bilingual Education.

Strongly Agree 1 2 3 4 5 6 Strongly Disagree

VALUE LABEL	VALUE	ABSOLUTE FREQUENCY	RELATIVE FREQUENCY (PERCENT)
NO RESPONSE	0.0	29	20.9
STRONGLY AGREE	1.00	25	18.0
	2.00	35	25.2
	3.00	19	13.7
	4.00	17	12.2
	5.00	9	6.5
STRONGLY DISAGREE	6.00	5	3.6
	TOTAL	139	100.0

Purpose of the Item

The intent of this item was to determine the relative success in the Institute's review of present and pending state Bilingual Bicultural Education legfslation and appropriations in helping define new directions for influencing future legislation in Bilingual Bicultural Education.

Analysis of the Results

Of the total (139) respondents 29 or 20.9% failed to respond to this item. Of those responding 60 or 43.2% felt the Institute was successful in its review of present and pending bilingual education legislation. On the other hand only 14 or 10.1% of the respondents felt that the Institute had not been successful in its review of bilingual education legislation for purposes of defining new directions for influencing future legislation. Thirty-six or 25.9% of the respondents felt indifferent toward this item.

Given these results it can be said that the Institute was successful in its review of present and pending state Bilingual Bicultural Education legislation and appropriations in helping define new directions for influencing future legislation in Bilingual Bicultural Education.

TABLE 17

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

7. To what extent did the Institute demonstrate techniques and methodology for successful implementation of Bilingual Education?

Very Little 1 2 3 4 5 6 Very Much

VALUE LABEL	VALUE	ABSOLUTE FREQUENCY	RELATIVE FREQUENCY (PERCENT)
NO RESPONSE	0.0	13	9.4
VERY LITTLE	1.00	11	7.9
	2.00	21	15.1
	3.00	15	10.8
	4.00	35	25.2
	5.00	29	20.9
VERY MUCH	6.00	15	10.8
	TOTAL	139	100.0

Purpose of the Item

The intent of this item was to determine the extent to which the Institute had demonstrated techniques and methodology for successful implementation of bilingual education.

Analysis of the Results

Of the total (139) respondents 13 or 9.4% chose not to respond to this item. Of those responding 43 or 31.7% felt the Institute had been successful in demonstrating techniques and methodology for successful implementation of bilingual education. On the other hand 32 or 23% of the respondents felt the Institute had not been successful in its demonstrations of techniques and methodology. An even greater number of participants 50 or 36% felt indifferent toward this item.

Given these results it can be said that the Institute participants were almost evenly split on how they felt concerning the Institute's ability to demonstrate techniques and methodology for the successful implementation of bilingual education. Future Institute designs may want to have demonstrated techniques and methodologies for successful implementation of bilingual education available for participants.

TABLE 18

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

8. Do you feel there is a need to formulate a statewide task force on Bilingual Education to serve in an advisory capacity to the State Department of Education?

_____ Yes _____ No

VALUE LABEL	VALUE	ABSOLUTE FREQUENCY	RELATIVE FREQUENCY (PERCENT)
NO RESPONSE	0.0	18	12.9
YES	1.00	119	85.6
NO	2.00	2	1.4
	TOTAL	139	100.0

Purpose of the Item

The intent of this item was to poll the Institute's participants on their assessment of a need to formulate a statewide task force on bilingual education to serve in an advisory capacity to the Arizona State Department of Education.

Analysis of the Results

Of the total (139) respondents 18 or 12.9% chose not to respond to this particular item. Of those responding 119 or 85.6% indicated that a statewide task force on bilingual education to serve in an advisory capacity be formulated. There were 2 or 1.4% respondents who felt that such a task force was not needed. An almost unanimous positive response to this item may well be interpreted as a dire and immediate need. The architects of this Institute might perhaps relate this information to those responsible for initiating plans to make the above inquiry a reality.

TABLE 19

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

9. The Institute provided me with data concerning pupil gains and performance of existing bilingual programs.

Strongly Agree — Strongly Disagree
1 2 3 4 5 6

VALUE LABEL	VALUE	ABSOLUTE FREQUENCY	RELATIVE FREQUENCY (PERCENT)
NO RESPONSE	0.0	20	14.4
STRONGLY AGREE	1.00	20	14.4
	2.00	25	18.0
	3.00	26	18.7
	4.00	17	12.2
	5.00	22	15.8
STRONGLY DISAGREE	6.00	9	6.5
	TOTAL	139	100.0

Purpose of the Item

The intent of this item was to determine the extent to which the Institute provided its participants with data concerning pupil gains and performance of existing bilingual programs.

Analysis of the Results

Of the total (139) respondents 20 or 14.4% did not respond to this particular item. Of those responding 45 or 32.4% felt confident that the Institute had provided them with information concerning pupil gains and performance of existing bilingual programs. On the other hand 31 or 22.3% of the participants felt the Institute had not provided them with similar data. There were 42 or 30.9% of the respondents who felt indifferent toward this item.

Given these results it can be said that the Institute was successful in providing 32.4% of its participants with data concerning pupil gains and performance of existing bilingual programs. This is an area which should be examined for future Arizona Institutes.

TABLE 20

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

10. The bilingual program of instruction should be conceived as a continuous program from preschool to high school.

Strongly Agree 1 2 3 4 5 6 Strongly Disagree

VALUE LABEL	VALUE	ABSOLUTE FREQUENCY	RELATIVE FREQUENCY (PERCENT)
NO RESPONSE	0.0	19	13.7
STRONGLY AGREE	1.00	82	59.0
	2.00	11	7.9
	3.00	6	4.3
	4.00	3	2.2
	5.00	5	3.6
STRONGLY DISAGREE	6.00	13	9.4
	TOTAL	139	100.0

Purpose of the Item

The intent of this item was to poll the Institute's participants concerning their conception of a bilingual bicultural program of instruction as a continuous program from preschool to high school.

Analysis of the Results

Of the total (139) respondents 19 or 13.7% chose not to respond to this item. Of those who responded 93 or 63.9% felt that bilingual bicultural education be conceived as a continuous program from preschool to high school. On the other hand only 18 or 13% of the respondents felt that bilingual education not be conceived as a continuous program from preschool to high school. Nine or 6.5% of the respondents felt indifferent toward this item.

Given these results it can be said that 63.9% of the Institute's participants felt that bilingual bicultural program of instruction be conceived as a continuous program from preschool to high school. It would be interesting to research the job classification of the 13% who do not see bilingual programs continuing from preschool to high school.

TABLE 21

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

11. Recruitment and hiring of teachers with an ethnic identity representative of the ethnic composition of the school is a high priority in my district or project.

Strongly Agree — Strongly Disagree
1 2 3 4 5 6

VALUE LABEL	VALUE	ABSOLUTE FREQUENCY	RELATIVE FREQUENCY (PERCENT)
NO RESPONSE	0.0	31	22.3
STRONGLY AGREE	1.00	37	26.6
	2.00	29	20.9
	3.00	13	9.4
	4.00	6	4.3
	5.00	12	8.6
STRONGLY DISAGREE	6.00	11	7.9
	TOTAL	139	100.0

Purpose of the Item

The intent of this item was to poll the Institute's participants on their views concerning the recruitment and hiring of Spanish-speaking teachers as a high priority in their district or project area.

Analysis of the Results

Of the total (139) respondents 31 or 22.3% did not respond to this item. Of those responding 66 or 47.5% felt the recruitment and hiring of Spanish-speaking teachers was a high priority in their district or project area. On the other hand 23 or 16.5% of the participants felt that recruitment and hiring of Spanish-speaking teachers was not a high priority in their districts. Twenty or 13.7% of the participants felt indifferent towards this item.

Given these results it can be said that high percentage of respondents (47.5%) of the Institute's participants feel that the recruitment and hiring of Spanish-speaking teachers was a high priority in their district or project area.

Suggestions for Further Analysis and/or Future Research

It would be interesting to learn ethnic background, sex, and employment status of the 11 (7.9%) respondents who "strongly disagreed" that the recruitment and hiring of Spanish-speaking teachers be a high priority in their respective districts.

TABLE 22

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

12. In preparation of teachers for bilingual programs, what priority should be given to the following:

	High Priority					Low Priority
a) The personal qualities of a teacher.	1	2	3	4	5	6

VALUE LABEL	VALUE	ABSOLUTE FREQUENCY	RELATIVE FREQUENCY (PERCENT)
NO RESPONSE	0.0	19	13.7
HIGH PRIORITY	1.00	76	54.7
	2.00	30	21.6
	3.00	4	2.9
	4.00	6	4.3
	5.00	3	2.2
LOW PRIORITY	6.00	1	0.7
	TOTAL	139	100.0

Purpose of the Item

The intent of this item was to poll the Institute's participants on their feelings concerning the type of priority given to the personal qualities of the teacher in preparation of teachers for bilingual programs.

Analysis of the Results

Of the total (139) respondents, 19 or 13.7% did not respond to this item. Of those responding, 106 or 76.3% felt the personal qualities of the teacher in their preparation for bilingual programs was a priority. On the other hand, only 4 or 2.9% of the respondents felt this should be a low priority. Ten or 7.2% of the respondents felt indifferent toward this item.

Given these results, it can be said that a high percentage (76.3%) of the Institute participants felt a high priority be given to the personal qualities of the teacher in their preparation for bilingual programs.

TABLE 23

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

12. In preparation of teachers for bilingual programs, what priority should be given to the following:

	High Priority					Low Priority
b) The teacher's knowledge of children and appreciation of the community from which their students derive.	1	2	3	4	5	6

VALUE LABEL	VALUE	ABSOLUTE FREQUENCY	RELATIVE FREQUENCY (PERCENT)
NO RESPONSE	0.0	16	11.5
HIGH PRIORITY	1.00	99	71.2
	2.00	15	10.8
	3.00	3	2.2
	4.00	1	0.7
LOW PRIORITY	6.00	5	3.6
	TOTAL	139	100.0

Purpose of the Item

The intent of this item was to poll the Institute's participants on their feelings concerning the type of priority given to the teacher's knowledge of children and appreciation of the community from which their students derive in their preparation for bilingual programs.

Analysis of the Results

Of the total (139) respondents, 16 or 11.5% failed to respond to this item. Of those responding, 114 or 82% felt that the teacher's knowledge and appreciation of the children's cultural environment is a high priority in the preparation of teachers for bilingual programs. On the other hand, only 6 or 3.6% of the participants felt that this consideration be given a low priority in the preparation of teachers for bilingual programs. Four or 2.9% of the participants felt indifferent toward this item.

Given these results, it can be said that a very high percentage (82%) of the Institute's participants felt that the teacher's knowledge of children and appreciation of the community from which their students derive was a high priority in the preparation of teachers for bilingual programs.

TABLE 24

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

12. In preparation of teachers for bilingual programs, what priority should be given to the following:

	High Priority					Low Priority
c) Skills in the teaching process.	1	2	3	4	5	6

VALUE LABEL	VALUE	ABSOLUTE FREQUENCY	RELATIVE FREQUENCY (PERCENT)
NO RESPONSE	0.0	18	12.9
HIGH PRIORITY	1.00	70	50.4
	2.00	32	23.0
	3.00	14	10.1
	4.00	2	1.4
	5.00	1	0.7
LOW PRIORITY	6.00	2	1.4
	TOTAL	139	100.0

Purpose of the Item

The intent of this item was to poll the Institute's participants on their feelings concerning the type of priority to be given to the skills in the teaching process in preparation of teachers for bilingual programs.

Analysis of the Results

Of the total (139) respondents, 18 or 12.9% failed to respond to this item. Of those responding, 102 or 73.4% felt that a high priority be given to the skills in the teaching process in preparing teachers for bilingual programs. On the other hand, 3 or 21.% of the respondents felt the skills in the teaching process be given a low priority. While the remaining 16 or 11.5% of the respondents felt indifferent toward this item.

Given these results, it can be said that a high percentage (73.4%) of the Institute's participants felt that the skill in the teaching process be given a high priority in the preparation of teachers for bilingual programs.

TABLE 25

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

12. In preparation of teachers for bilingual programs, what priority should be given to the following:

	High Priority					Low Priority
d) The teacher be bilingual.	1	2	3	4	5	6

VALUE LABEL	VALUE	ABSOLUTE FREQUENCY	RELATIVE FREQUENCY (PERCENT)
NO RESPONSE	0.0	17	12.2
HIGH PRIORITY	1.00	76	54.7
	2.00	19	13.7
	3.00	17	12.2
	4.00	3	2.2
	5.00	3	2.2
LOW PRIORITY	6.00	4	2.9
	TOTAL	139	100.0

Purpose of the Item

The intent of this item was to poll the Institute's participants on their feelings concerning the type of priority to be given to the teacher being bilingual in this preparation for bilingual programs.

Analysis of the Results

Of the total (139) respondents, 17 or 12.2% did not respond to this item. Of those responding, 95 or 68.4% felt that a high priority be given to the fact that the teacher be bilingual in preparation of teachers for bilingual education. On the other hand 7 or 5.1% of the participants felt that the need for the teacher to be bilingual is a low priority in their preparation for bilingual programs. Twenty or 14.4% of the respondents felt indifferent toward this item.

Given these results, it can be said that a high percentage (68.4%) of the Institute's participants felt the teacher be bilingual, be given a high priority in their preparation for bilingual education.

TABLE 26

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

13. The Institute fulfilled my expectation.

Strongly Agree 1 2 3 4 5 6 Strongly Disagree

VALUE LABEL	VALUE	ABSOLUTE FREQUENCY	RELATIVE FREQUENCY (PERCENT)
NO RESPONSE	0.0	17	12.2
STRONGLY AGREE	1.00	30	21.6
	2.00	40	28.8
	3.00	31	22.3
	4.00	9	6.5
	5.00	8	5.8
STRONGLY DISAGREE	6.00	4	2.9
	TOTAL	139	100.0

Purpose of the Item

The intent of this item was to determine the extent to which the Institute had fulfilled its participants' expectations. One cannot determine from this item the nature of the participants' expectations of the Institute, this item attempts to assess the extent to which the Institute fulfilled such expectations.

Analysis of the Results

Of the total (139) respondents, 17 or 12.2% chose not to respond to this item. Of those responding, 70 or 50.4% felt the Institute had fulfilled whatever expectations they had concerning the Institute. On the other hand, 12 or 8.7% of the respondents felt the Institute had not fulfilled their particular expectations. However, 40 or 28.8% of the respondents were not certain whether or not the Institute had been successful in fulfilling their expectations.

Given these results, it can be said that the Institute was successful in fulfilling the varied expectations of a high percentage (50.5%) of the participants. This item has implications for future state Bilingual Institutes in carefully setting forth intended goals and objectives along with anticipated outcomes from the given Institute.*

---

*The Esquibel-Easton Model for Analyzing Institutes presents a method for looking at inputs and outcomes of institutes.

TABLE 27

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

14. My overall impression of this Institute is:

Excellent 1 2 3 4 5 6 Poor

VALUE LABEL	VALUE	ABSOLUTE FREQUENCY	RELATIVE FREQUENCY (PERCENT)
NO RESPONSE	0.0	15	10.8
EXCELLENT	1.00	53	38.1
	2.00	33	23.7
	3.00	24	17.3
	4.00	9	6.5
POOR	5.00	5	3.6
	TOTAL	139	100.0

Item #15 read as follows: "Please make any comments you would like with regard to the Institute." Of the total (139) respondents, 85 or 61% did not respond to this particular item. Those who chose to respond made comments that were positive, negative and/or suggested recommendations. The following is representative of the positive comments made concerning the Institute:

> It was a very good Institute and more should be held. All speakers and workshops were very good.
>
> Parent involvement meeting very good in providing insights into gut-level operations.
>
> The work in putting this Institute together is a great tribute to the Institute planners. Super.
>
> The workshops and speeches were very informative. The media centers were excellent and a wide variety of the materials were presented.
>
> More often, more people.
>
> The Institute's work is highly commendable. It provided a very good opportunity for other persons already familiar with bilingual/bicultural educational concepts to improve their familiarity and to become more involved.
>
> The exhibits were outstanding in the elementary levels but what about secondary education and those of us involved in adult education.
>
> The lunch and dinner speakers, especially Dr. Casso, weremost interesting. On the whole, the Institute was informative and successful. Hope to have one every year.
>
> First time I attended an Institute and I'm very happy I did. It let me know somebody is caring about the Chicano.

My feelings of this Institute is that it is one of our stepping stones toward our goal.

The Elm Street School Project with Mr. Watson as director was exceptional. Watching bilingual education in action in their excellent surroundings was most pleasurable.

Level of participation was excellent. This Institute seemed to come from the heart as well as the mind, always with the idea of providing greater educational opportunities for kids.

I think the exhibits were excellent in helping to bring everything together. We could see how the bilingual program is a reality and not just talk. This was most helpful.

Outstanding Institute.

Typical of the negative comments made by the respondents concerning the Institute include the following:

Lack of parent involvement. Most topics geared to teachers. Most topics very ineffectual.

Too structured. Very outstanding for those with strong Spanish background, but most other groups with language problems were ignored.

No time to speak with participants, to get between meetings, to attend all pertinent sessions.

It was not fair to make us go up to the VFW three times.

Adult education was overlooked.

Speeches were too long.

Participants' Recommendations

A number of recommendations concerning the Institute were offered by many of the respondents. Some of the recommendations listed below were offered more than once. It is important to note that these recommendations are as follows:

> More involvement of "power people" i.e. administrators, curriculum and policy makers. . .More involvement of "Anglo" people.
>
> Needed hard data on Elm Street School and statistics test results to prove (as much as possible) this result.
>
> There needed to be more attention to Indian Education and displays of materials used - as in Rough Rock demonstration school.
>
> Needed an explanation of what each session would deal with.
>
> I recommend for future Bilingual Workshops that more attention be paid to the whole group involved by having them participate in ideas, personal views, etc. on Bilingual Education. Let's make a workshop an effective tool, not a room for personal monologues.
>
> Next Institute please provide more specific information for teachers to take back to their districts.
>
> More films and visual aids by the speakers would have helped to summarize the information given.
>
> When is the next one?
>
> Talks should be more specific, some were too general. More how to demonstrations. Invite the "power structure" people - city, state level, and school boards.
>
> More on methodology and teacher training.
>
> More evaluative responses should have been presented as far as these bilingual education programs have succeeded or failed.
>
> The time schedule should have been better adhered to.

More teacher aides should attend these workshops.

Have an annual bilingual-bicultural institute and at least one workshop on bilingual-bicultural education during the school year.

Please repeat and invite a larger representation of faculty.

The next step should be regional workshops to encourage and further bilingual education in Arizona.

The organization should have been better in one building to cut down on confusion and time wasted in transportation.